

Robert M. Manley (*pro hac vice*)
Travis E. DeArman (*pro hac vice*)
Patrick Pijls (*pro hac vice*)
MCKOOL SMITH, PC
300 Crescent Court, Suite 1500
Dallas, TX 75201
Tel: (214) 978-4000
Fax: (214) 978-4044
rmanley@mckoolsmith.com
tdearman@mckoolsmith.com
ppijls@mckoolsmith.com

J Christopher Jorgensen (Bar No. 5382)
LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP
3993 Howard Hughes Pkwy, Suite 600
Las Vegas, NV 89169
Tel: (702) 949-8200
cjorgensen@lewisroca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Internet Sports International, Ltd.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Internet Sports International, Ltd.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Amelco USA, LLC. et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-00893-ART-NJK

**JOINT MOTION TO MODIFY
SCHEDULING ORDER**

Plaintiff Internet Sports International, Ltd. (“ISI”) and Defendants Amelco USA, LLC and Amelco UK, Ltd. (collectively, the “Defendants”) jointly request, pursuant to Local Rules IA 6-1 and LR 26-1 and 26-3, that the Court modify the scheduling order, entered on November 6, 2023,¹ to extend all remaining deadlines by sixty days.

¹ ECF No. 58.

A. The Parties jointly request an extension.

The extensions jointly requested by the Parties are included in the chart below:

Event	Current Deadline	Proposed Amended Deadline
Initial Experts	April 11, 2024	June 10, 2024
Rebuttal Experts	May 9, 2024	July 8, 2024
Discovery Cut-Off	May 23, 2024	July 22, 2024
Dispositive Motions	June 13, 2024	August 12, 2024
Joint Proposed Pretrial Order	July 11, 2024 or 30 days after resolution of dispositive motions, whichever dates comes sooner	September 9, 2024, or 30 days after resolution of dispositive motions, whichever dates comes sooner

This litigation concerns issues relating to Intellectual Property law, Gaming law, and Commercial contracts law. Plaintiff believes it provided services and intellectual property to the Defendants and has not been paid for those services or the Defendants' use of Plaintiff's intellectual property. Defendants deny Plaintiff's allegations.

This Court has broad discretion to issue, modify, and enforce its scheduling orders. *See* ECF No. 29 at 2-3 (describing the Court's authority to manage its docket and the standards for granting extensions). The existing scheduling order is taken seriously, and the Parties understand any request for extension must be supported by good cause. *Id.* The Parties submit that this standard has been met, for at least two reasons.

B. Good cause exists for the requested Extension.

1. The Parties continue to work towards discovery, but expect some issues will require court intervention.

a. Discovery Completed

All Parties are diligently prosecuting their claims or defenses.

i. The Parties held the Rule 26(f) conference on July 27, 2023.

ii. ISI and Amelco USA, LLC exchanged their Rule 26(a) disclosures on April 28, 2023; Amelco UK served Rule 26(a) disclosures on August 31, 2023, and ISI served supplemental disclosures on September 19, 2023.

1 iii. Amelco USA, LLC propounded interrogatories, requests for admissions, and
2 requests for production on Plaintiff in the state court proceedings prior to removal on May 22,
3 2023, and re-served its requests on Plaintiff under the federal rules after removal on August 3,
4 2023. Plaintiff served objections and responses on September 19, 2023. Plaintiff also has produced
5 more than 50,000 pages of documents to Defendants. Plaintiff has represented that it intends to
6 supplement its document production and interrogatory responses.

7 iv. Plaintiff propounded interrogatories and requests for production on October 20,
8 2023. Defendants served objections and responses on December 4, 2023.

9 **b. Discovery Remaining**

10 i. Plaintiff sent a proposed Protective Order and ESI Protocol to Defendants on
11 October 20, 2023. The Court entered the Protective Order on November 20, 2023, and the Parties
12 reached agreement on the ESI Protocol.

13 ii. Plaintiff presently anticipates that the liability and damages issues presented in this
14 case may require expert testimony regarding industry standards, technical requirements, and
15 damages. Plaintiff has engaged experts. Defendants will disclose experts in accordance with the
16 Court's scheduling order.

17 iii. Plaintiff has identified approximately thirteen individuals in three categories of
18 witnesses who may need to be deposed within the next three to four months, presumably prior to
19 when the expert witnesses issue their reports. These witnesses consist of current employees,
20 including FRCP 30(b)(6) representatives, of Defendants; former employees of Defendants; and
21 third-party individuals. The first deposition is scheduled for January 31, 2024.

22 At least some of these individuals are located in the United Kingdom, and Plaintiff may be
23 forced to serve subpoenas for testimony through the Hague Convention. Plaintiff has secured UK
24 counsel to facilitate this process if it proves necessary. Defendants are still in the process of
25
26
27
28

1 evaluating Plaintiff's claims and their defenses. However based on Plaintiff's current claims and
2 allegations, Defendants expect that they will need to depose similar categories of witnesses to
3 Plaintiff.

4
5 **2. The Parties attempted to resolve their dispute via mediation, without**
6 **success.**

7 The parties attempted to resolve this case without further judicial intervention. To that end,
8 the Parties conducted a mediation on January 19, 2024 before Hon. Peggy Leen (Ret.). The
9 mediation was unsuccessful. In order to preserve the Parties' and court resources, the Parties
10 focused their efforts on meditation over the past 60 days. Now that mediation has proven
11 unsuccessful, the parties will resume discovery in earnest. Specifically, the parties refrained from
12 taking depositions prior to mediation. In particular, the Parties wish to limit the burden on the
13 Court with associated with resolving forthcoming discovery disputes and motions practice. The
14 parties will continue to work together in an effort to narrow those disputes.

15
16 To accomplish this, while also permitting time to complete discovery and other pretrial
17 matters, the Parties request a sixty day extension of the aforementioned deadlines. The Parties do
18 not seek delay for their own sake, but jointly request an extension in good faith so that they may
19 pursue the just and efficient resolution to this dispute.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DATED: January 24, 2024

MCKOOL SMITH, PC

/s/ Travis DeArman

Robert M. Manley, (*pro hac vice*)
rmanley@mckoolsmith.com
Travis E. DeArman, (*pro hac vice*)
tdearman@mckoolsmith.com
Patrick Pijls, (*pro hac vice*)
ppijls@mckoolsmith.com
300 Crescent Court, Suite 1500
Dallas, TX 75201
Tel: (214) 978-4000
Fax: (214) 978-4044

J Christopher Jorgensen (Ba No. 5382)
cjorgensen@lewisroca.com
LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP
3993 Howard Hughes Pkwy, Suite 600
Las Vegas, NV 89169
Tel: (702) 949-8200
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Internet Sports International, Ltd.

FENNEMORE CRAIG, PC

/S/ John D. Tennert

John D. Tennert, III
Nevada Bar No. 11728
jtennert@fennemorelaw.com
Wade Beavers
Nevada Bar No. 13451
wbeavers@fennemorelaw.com
MaryJo E. Smart
Nevada Bar No. 16139
msmart@fennemorelaw.com
7800 Rancharra Parkway
Reno, NV 89511
Tel: (775) 788-2200
Fax: (775) 788-2283

Attorneys for Defendants Amelco USA, LLC and
Amelco UK, Ltd.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DATED: _____

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that service of the foregoing was filed on January 24, 2024 via the Court's CM/ECF electronic filing system addressed to all Parties on the e-service list.

/s/ Travis E. DeArman
Travis DeArman